

# Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/935,988

Applicant(s)

SICIUS ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel S. Metzmaier

Art Unit

1712

## All Participants:

(1) Daniel S. Metzmaier.

(2) Diderico van Eyl.

Status of Application: amended

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 10 December 2004

Time: ~ 5:05 PM; ~11:35 AM, respectively.

## Type of Interview:



Telephonic



Video Conference



Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

*claim 2 regarding 35 USC 112, first and second paragraphs.*

Claims discussed:

*2 and 26.*

Prior art documents discussed:

*none.*

## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

## Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: examiner proposed cancelling claims 2 and 26. Claim 2 was noted to define an aqueous compositions or a limitation based on the method of using rather than the tablet form of claim 1 and the remaining claims. Claim 26 was not seen as further limiting by the examiner since it merely recites an inherent property of the claim 1 compositions and/or the intended use of the compositions provided for in claim 1. (12/10/04) Discussed changes to make alternative language read more clearly consistent with the specification at pages 9 and 10. Applicant authorized amendment.